



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,490	09/30/2003	Jeyhan Karaoguz	14279US02	5995
23446 7590 06/08/2010 MCANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD 500 WEST MADISON STREET SUITE 3400 CHICAGO, IL 60661				
EXAMINER RYAN, PATRICK A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2427				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/08/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/675,490

Applicant(s)

KARAOGUZ ET AL.

Examiner

PATRICK A. RYAN

Art Unit

2427

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 April 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/CD)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is made in response to Request for Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114 ("Reply"), filed April 16, 2010. Applicant has amended Claims 1, 11, and 21; no claims have been canceled; and no claims have been added. As amended, Claims 1-37 are presented for examination.

2. In Office action of January 21, 2010 ("Office Action"):

Claims 1-7, 10, 11-17, 20, 21-27, 30-32, 34, and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Novak (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0104099 A1), in view of Foreman et al, United States Patent (6,628,303 B1).

Claim 8, 9, 18, 19, 28, and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Novak and Foreman, in view of Weber, United States Patent (7,284,032).

Claim 33, 35, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Novak and Foreman, in view of Applicant's admission of fact.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

3. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on January 21, 2010 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments, see Reply Page 12-25, with respect to Claims 1, 11, and 21 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
5. Applicant presents that the Novak and Foreman do not teach the Claim 1 limitation "editing, at said first geographic location, said previously created metadata associate with said media content, said editing based on said additional media content" because "entering of the media object information and preferences [taught by Novak] does not include any modification to the related media content" (Reply Pages 19-20; with further reference to Fields 706, as discussed by Novak in Paragraphs [0063-0067] and shown in Fig. 7; where underlined limitations are currently amended). The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner has previously presented that Novak demonstrates "editing, at said first geographic location, metadata associated with said media content" by way of Fields 706 of Fig. 7 as described in Paragraphs [0063-0067]. Regarding Fig. 7, Novak discloses that "[a] plurality of headings 704 identifies a corresponding plurality of fields 706 where the individual can enter media object information or preferences. As an example, the headings 704 can include identifiers for date, time slot, media object

identifier (ID), media object description, file type, preview video, etc.” (Novak Paragraph [0063]).

The Examiner submits Paragraph [42] of the instant application as an example of Applicant intended meaning of “metadata associated with said media content”:

In instances where a user may perform personal media program production on raw media content, such as digital pictures, an associated file comprising metadata information may also be updated as part of the media program production process. Metadata may be created by the media exchange software platform and may contain information that may describe various characteristics and attributes of the associated media content. Additionally, whenever a user may select media content for consumption, metadata related information may inform the media exchange software platform of the characteristics and attributes of the selected media content. Accordingly, the media exchange software platform may properly process the media content for consumption. Metadata information may be meaningful with regards to the raw media content that it may describe. For example, metadata may be utilized to inform a media exchange software platform of a title that should be placed in the channel view, options that should be presented in sub-menus, and the amount of time that may be allocated for queuing media content.

As underlined in the above passage, the disclosure of the instant application explicitly states that “a title that should be placed in the channel view” is a form of metadata. It is the Examiner’s position that Novak teachings of entering media object information, such as a media object description, sufficiently addresses the claimed “editing metadata associated with said media content” as required by Claim 1, 11, and 21 (and clarified below). As currently amended, the Examiner submits that the above cited teachings of Novak also sufficiently teach the limitation of “creating metadata associated with said existing media content” (as presented below).

6. As the Examiner stated in Office Action Page 7 “it is unclear within the disclosure of Novak if the existing media content is modified with additional media content to produce the media program and if the editing process includes editing previously

created metadata based on said additional media content" and therefore provides the Foreman reference to supplement the teachings of Novak.

Applicant presents (Reply Pages 20-23; with further reference to Reply Pages 12-14) that Forman does not teach these limitations because "1. Foreman's Storyboard Descriptions Are Not Previously Created Metadata Associated with Media Content" and "2. Foreman's FIG. 16 Does Not Disclose Editing of Previously Created Metadata". Regarding the teachings of Foreman, Applicant particularly notes that "...when the storyboard shot descriptions 87 are created, they are not metadata (or 'previously created metadata') as they are not associated with any video data (as there is no video brought in for editing)" (Reply Page 21) and "...prior to capturing the video data, the storyboard shot descriptions 87 simply form an outline and cannot be considered a metadata as they are not actually associated with any video data" (Reply Page 22). The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

It is the Examiner position that Foreman demonstrates at least two instances of the claimed "metadata" and that Foreman's teaching of "metadata" created during the editing process has not been identified as the claimed "previously created metadata". In particular, Foreman describes "clips" and "shots", where the process of Figure 16 is "an example operation in which the clip descriptions and shot descriptions are synchronized" (Col. 10 Lines 56-58). At Step 226 of Fig. 16 metadata is associated with a media program ("Associate Data File With a Clip" of Fig. 16, as described in Col. 10 Lines 60-65). The Examiner notes that "metadata is associated with a media program" using the interface of Figure 8 (as described in Col. 9 Line 20—Col. 10 Line 35). Then

at Step 230, a process of editing the previously created metadata (from Step 226) is performed based on additional media content ("description modifies its duration and pointer to reference the new clip description", as shown in Fig. 16 and described in Col. 10 Line 65—Col. 11 Line 2; with further reference to Col. 11 Line 3—Col. 12 Line 31). The Examiner notes that "editing the previously created metadata" is performed by way of the interface of Figure 9 (as described in Col. 11 Line 3—Col. 12 Line 31). The Examiner additionally notes that Forman discloses "[a]fter clips for a movie have been captured, more finely detailed editing of the video program can be started" (Col. 11 Lines 3-4). Therefore, it is the Examiners position that Forman do in fact teach "editing previously created metadata" as required by Claims 1, 11, and 21.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

7. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

8. Claims 11-20, 34, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims set forth a "machine readable medium." However, the specification as originally filed does not explicitly define the machine readable medium. The United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) is obliged to give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification during proceedings before the USPTO. See *In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (during patent examination the pending claims must be interpreted

as broadly as their terms reasonably allow). The broadest reasonable interpretation of a claim drawn to a computer readable media (also called machine readable medium and other such variations) typically covers forms of non-transitory tangible media and transitory propagating signals per se in view of the ordinary and customary meaning of computer readable media, particularly when the specification is absent an explicit definition or is silent. See MPEP 2111.01. When the broadest reasonable interpretation of a claim covers a signal per se, the claim must be rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as covering non-statutory subject matter. See *In re Nuijten*, 500 F.3d 1346, 1356-57 (Fed. Cir. 2007) (transitory embodiments are not directed to statutory subject matter) and Interim Examination Instructions for Evaluating Subject Matter Eligibility Under 35 U.S.C. § 101, Aug. 24, 2009; p. 2.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1-7, 10, 11-17, 20, 21-27, 30-32, 34, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Novak (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0104099 A1), in view of Foreman et al, United States Patent (6,628,303 B1) hereinafter "Foreman".

11. In reference to Claim 1, Novak teaches a method for producing and delivering media content (as shown in Figs. 4 and 11; with further reference to the descriptions of Paragraphs [0056-0060; 0077-0086]), the method comprising:

establishing a personal television channel at a first geographic location ("Joe's TV Channel" as shown in Figs. 6-9 created by the method of Figs. 4 and 11; With further reference to the operations of Upload Source 122, as described in Paragraphs [0039,0040,0041,0046,0055,0056, 0068,0070,0074, and 0080]), said personal television channel associated with existing media content ("Joe's TV Channel" with associated with media objects, as shown in Fig. 7 and described in Paragraph [0039,0064]);

creating metadata associated with said existing media content (Fields 706 of Fig. 7 allow an individual to enter media object information or preferences, such as identifiers for date, time slot, media object identifier (ID), media object description, or file type, as described in Paragraph [0063-0067]);

However, Novak does not clearly disclose modifying said existing media content with additional media content to produce a media program, wherein said metadata is created previously to said modifying; and editing, at said first geographic location, said previously created metadata associated with said media content, said editing based on said additional media content.

In a similar field of invention, Foreman teaches a graphical user interface for producing a video program using planning, capturing, editing, and recording functions (Abstract, Col. 4 Lines 16-33). Foreman further discloses the Interface 56 of Fig. 9,

which allows a user to modify existing media content with additional media content such as transitions between clips (using effects tab Interface 153, as described in Col. 15 Lines 13-39; with further reference to Fig. 10), titles (using titles tab Interface 154, as described in Col. 15 Line 40—Col. 16 Line 7; with further reference to Fig. 11), and sounds such as voice-over commentary (using sound tab Interface 155, as described in Col. 16 Lines 8-27; with further reference to Fig. 12 and Interface 220). Additionally, Fig. 16 of Forman demonstrates “an example operation in which the clip descriptions and shot descriptions are synchronized” (Col. 10 Lines 56-58). In particular, at Step 226 of Fig. 16 metadata is associated with a media program (“Associate Data File With a Clip” of Fig. 16, as described in Col. 10 Lines 60-65). Then at Step 230, a process of editing the previously created metadata (from Step 226) is performed based on additional media content (“description modifies its duration and pointer to reference the new clip description”, as shown in Fig. 16 and described in Col. 10 Line 65—Col. 11 Line 2; with further reference to Col. 11 Line 3—Col. 12 Line 31).

Both Novak and Foreman teach methods and systems for generating a media program from existing media content with associated metadata. Novak discloses a method of allowing an individual to control aspects of the media program such as content type, length, sequence, and availability (Paragraph [0025, 0063-0067]). Foreman discloses a method similar to Novak and further provides an interface allowing a user to modify aspects of individual clips with additional content such as transitions and voice-over commentary (as presented above). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the

method of personal media program generation taught by Novak with the method of modifying media content with additional content, as taught by Foreman, in order to provide the user with the ability to further personalize the media presentation with content such as voice-over commentary.

The combination of Novak and Forman additionally teaches associating said produced media program and said edited metadata with said established personal television channel (Novak: EPG 802 of Fig. 8 and EPG 152 of Fig. 9, which show "Joe's TV Channel" in association with the broadcast times and Conventional Television Broadcast Channels of EPG 802, as described in Paragraphs [0071,0072]); and

communicating said produced media program along with said edited metadata to another geographic location (Novak: "Joe's TV Channel" is then communicated to the end user of STB 152 according the schedule times established by Upload Source 122, as described in Paragraphs [0059,0072]. In addition, the metadata edited by Upload Source such as program titles, scheduled broadcast times, and object IDs are communicated with the program content to the end user, as shown in Figs. 8 and 9, which correspond to the data of Fig. 7).

12. In reference to Claim 2, the combination of Novak and Foreman teaches the method of Claim 1, comprising acquiring prior to said edition, said metadata associated with the media content (Novak: the File Type, shown in Fig. 7 and described in Paragraph [0064] is available to the upload individual prior to editing the media content).

13. In reference to Claim 3, the combination of Novak and Foreman teaches the method of Claim 2 wherein the acquired metadata is one or both of program metadata

and/or primitive metadata (Novak teaches program metadata, such as Fields 704 and 706 as described in Paragraphs [0063-0070]).

14. In reference to Claim 4, the combination of Novak and Foreman teaches the method of Claim 1 comprising delivering said produced media program along with said edited metadata from said first geographic location to a second geographic location, for displaying at said second geographic location (Novak: upload individual at Upload Source 122, which can be a set top box, provides the programming of "Joe's Channel" to an end user at STB 152 for display in EPG 152, as described in Paragraphs [0073-0075] and shown in Fig. 9; with further reference to [0032,0039] and Fig. 1).

15. In reference to Claim 5, the combination of Novak and Foreman teaches the method of Claim 2 comprising updating the acquired metadata associated with media content to reflect at least a portion of changes associated with the modifying (Novak: "obtaining program updates" and "provisioning of the synthetic channel" in EPG 152, as described in Paragraphs [0059]; with further reference to Paragraph [0083] "updated EPG 153" performed at Block 1112 of Fig. 11).

16. In reference to Claim 6, the combination of Novak and Foreman teaches the method of Claim 5 comprising displaying at least a portion of the produced media program (Novak: Media Program Display 1002 of Fig. 10, displaying a synthetic channel or media program, as described in Paragraph [0076]).

17. In reference to Claim 7, the combination of Novak and Foreman teaches the method of Claim 1 wherein the modifying comprises augmenting and editing the media content (Novak: Interface 702 of Fig. 7 allows schedule information, such as the

broadcast date or time slot, and program information, such as description and cast, to be modified by the uploading individual, as described in Paragraph [0063]. In addition, Foreman teaches insertion, deletion, and trimming operations for adding and removing frames or clips, as described in Col. 12 Lines 32-44 and shown in Figs. 17a-24m).

18. In reference to Claim 10, the combination of Novak and Foreman teaches the method of Claim 1 comprising synchronizing the modified media content for presentation in the personal television channel (Novak: content modified by uploading individual is synchronized to the time axis of EPG 152 based on the associated time slots of "Joe's TV Channel", as shown in Figs. 8 and 9; with further reference to Paragraphs [0063,0071-0075]).

19. In reference to Claim 32, the combination of Novak and Foreman teaches the method according to claim 1, wherein said communicating comprises pushing said produced media program along with said edited metadata directly to said another geographic location, for consumption at said another geographic location (Novak: upload individual at Upload Source 122, which can be a set top box, provides the programming of "Joe's Channel" to an end user at STB 152 for display in EPG 152, as described in Paragraphs [0073-0075] and shown in Fig. 9; with further reference to [0032,0039], Fig. 1, and Fig. 11 as described in Paragraphs [0077-0086]).

20. In reference to Claim 11, the combination of Novak and Foreman teaches a machine-readable storage with at least one coded section for producing and delivering media content (Novak: the method of Fig. 11 is stored on and executed from a machine-

readable media as part of STB 152 or other local storage unit, as disclosed in Paragraph [0077]; with further reference to “token” program described in Paragraph [0058]), that is executable by a machine (Novak: STB 152, as described in Paragraph [0077]) to perform the method of Claim 1 (as addressed above).

21. The limitations of Claim 12 have been addressed with Claims 2 and 11.
22. The limitations of Claim 13 have been addressed with Claims 3 and 11.
23. The limitations of Claim 14 have been addressed with Claims 4 and 11.
24. The limitations of Claim 15 have been addressed with Claims 5 and 11.
25. The limitations of Claim 16 have been addressed with Claims 6 and 11.
26. The limitations of Claim 17 have been addressed with Claims 7 and 11.
27. The limitations of Claim 20 have been addressed with Claims 10 and 11.
28. The limitations of Claim 34 have been addressed with Claims 32 and 11.

29. In reference to Claim 21, the combination of Novak and Foreman teaches a system for producing and delivering media content (Novak: Figure 1, as introduced in Paragraph [0025]), the system comprising a processor (Novak: STB 152 executing the flow diagram of Fig. 11 as described in Paragraphs [0077-0086]) for executing the method of Claim 1 (as addressed above).
30. The limitations of Claim 22 have been addressed with Claims 2 and 21.
31. The limitations of Claim 23 have been addressed with Claims 3 and 21.
32. The limitations of Claim 24 have been addressed with Claims 4 and 21.
33. The limitations of Claim 25 have been addressed with Claims 5 and 21.

34. The limitations of Claim 26 have been addressed with Claims 6 and 21.
35. The limitations of Claim 27 have been addressed with Claims 7 and 21.
36. The limitations of Claim 30 have been addressed with Claims 10 and 21.
37. In reference to Claim 31, the combination of Novak and Foreman teaches the system according to Claim 21, wherein the at least one processor is a media processing system processor (Novak: STB 152 executing the flow diagram of Fig. 11 as described in Paragraphs [0077-0086]).
38. The limitations of Claim 36 have been addressed with Claims 32 and 21.
39. Claim 8, 9, 18, 19, 28, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Novak and Foreman, in view of Weber, United States Patent (7,284,032).
40. In reference to Claim 8, The combination of Novak and Foreman teaches the method of Claim 1 and further teaches that metadata associated with media content is periodically updated to reflect changes made to the EPG 152 (as Novak describes in Paragraphs [0059,0083]), but the combination does not explicitly teach determining whether a media program comprises the modified media content.

In a similar field of invention, Weber teaches a method and system for enabling a user to define a data segment, record the data segment, and transmit the information associated with the data segment to a remote location (Abstract). In addition, Weber teaches a "highlight guide", shown in Fig. 3, that is used to display information regarding

segments that have been defined by a user and recorded by PVR 11, 21, 31 (as described in Col. 4 Lines 6-39). Weber's further teaches a method of detecting modified content that has been added to the highlight guide (as shown in Step 503 of Fig. 5 and described in Col. 6 Lines 12-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the personal media channel containing modified media content and associated metadata, as taught by the combination of Novak and Foreman, with a means for determining if the media content has been modified, as taught by Weber, in order to provide the end user with the most up to date content. In addition, the detection of modified content would allow the end user to decide weather to accept or reject the updated content (as Weber discusses in Col. 6 Lines 12-35).

41. In reference to Claim 9, the combination of Novak, Foreman, and Weber teach the method of Claim 8 comprising, if the media program comprises the modified media content, processing the media program based on metadata associated with the modified media content (Weber teaches that if a modified segment is detected at Step 503, the highlight guide is updated at Step 504, as described in Col. 6 Lines 12-35; with further reference to Fig. 4 and Col. 5 Lines 12-49 describing the process of editing and generating metadata corresponding to the media content).

42. In reference to Claim 18, the combination of Novak, Foreman, and Weber teach these limitations, as addressed in Claim 11 and Claim 8.

43. In reference to Claim 19, the combination of Novak, Foreman, and Weber teach these limitations, as addressed in Claim 11 and Claim 9.

44. In reference to Claim 28, the combination of Novak, Foreman, and Weber teach these limitations, as addressed in Claim 21 and Claim 8.

45. In reference to Claim 29, the combination of Novak, Foreman, and Weber teach these limitations, as addressed in Claim 21 and Claim 9.

46. Claim 33, 35, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Novak and Foreman, in view of Applicant's admission of fact (See Office action mailed January 21, 2010 Page 5).

47. In reference to Claim 33, the combination of Novak and Foreman teaches the method according to Claim 32. Novak additionally discloses that Upload Source 122 can comprise a set top box and function as an "individual", an "organization", or a "consumer", as disclosed in Paragraphs [0039,0056] and the STB 152 is operated by an end user, as disclosed in Paragraphs [0032,0069]. However, it is unclear with in the disclosures of Novak and Foreman if the first and second geographic locations are residential locations.

Applicant's admission of fact provides that that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized that it is common practice in the art of video distribution to operate set-top box devices in residential locations. One of

ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to operate a set-top box in a residential location in order to distribute multimedia content to locations where people live.

48. The limitations of Claim 35 have been addressed with the machine-readable storage of Claim 11 and the method of Claim 33.

49. The limitations of Claim 37 have been addressed with the system of Claim 21 and the method of Claim 33.

Conclusion

50. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PATRICK A. RYAN whose telephone number is (571)270-5086. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon to Thur, 8:30am - 6:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Scott Beliveau can be reached on (571) 272-7343. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/P. A. R./
Examiner, Art Unit 2427
Thursday, June 03, 2010

/Scott Beliveau/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2427